



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of errors. Most of his work, therefore, has been in need of revision. His *Poetae Latini Minores* is no exception. The careful scholarship of Vollmer is just what was required for a revision of Baehrens' work. The fifth volume is in reality not a revision but an entirely new work, and there is no reason for retaining Baehrens' name on the title-page as far as this volume is concerned. The edition is indeed not altogether new in its present form, as it is an abridgment of Vollmer's *Dracontius* in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, published in 1905. One-third of Baehrens' edition contained works of *Dracontius*. The new edition contains *Dracontius* only, including the Christian poems, which, following the original plan of the work, were omitted in the first edition. Two short poems which were included by Baehrens and whose *Dracontian* authorship is based on mere guess are omitted in the new edition. The somewhat doubtful *De aegritudine Perdicae* is included.

The first ten poems of the *Carmina Profana* of Baehrens are now entitled *Romulea*. This name is found in the Verona *Florilegium*, a source not used by Baehrens. A very interesting paleographical fact about the *Romulea* is that the single extant manuscript contains two copies of poem X on separate quires, one of which, according to Vollmer, is part of the original from which the entire manuscript was copied. This shows in an interesting way how the quires of a manuscript were separated for copying purposes. Vollmer's terminology is unsatisfactory and confusing at this point, though, to be sure, he is merely following Baehrens: he calls the manuscript as a whole *N*, but in the repeated portion he calls the original *N* and the copy *n*. On the page explaining the *sigla* of the manuscript it is disturbing to see, in the midst of the Latin discussion, such forms as *Brüssel*, *Neapel*, *Mailand*.

The text differs considerably from that of Baehrens. Many of the latter's conjectures are rejected in favor of those of Duhn, the first editor of the complete *Romulea*, or of the manuscript readings.

B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IOWA

The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires.

By A. E. R. BOAK. (University of Michigan Studies.) Macmillan, 1919. Pp. x+160.

An adequate constitutional history of the Roman Empire has yet to be written. Mommsen, in his *Staatsrecht*, has assembled with painstaking care the materials for the study of the principate; and Seeck and others have given us admirable general descriptions of the oriental monarchy of the fourth and succeeding centuries. But there is no detailed study of the transition from the one to the other. The ordinary student is left with the

impression that Diocletian's reorganization of the empire had no bases in precedent. Moreover, most books upon the imperial constitution are marred by one fault. Chronology is largely ignored. Documents of one century are freely combined with documents of a century earlier or later, and the result is at best a *Gesamtanschauung* of the imperial system in which the evolution and decay of institutions are obscured. Some day, it is to be hoped, we shall have a much clearer view than is now available of the supersession of the republican institutions of Rome by the direct administration of the princeps, of the destruction of municipal self-government through the interference of imperial officials, and of the various effects—for the most part malign—of the disappearance of the very idea of political freedom in the ancient world. Before such a book can be written, however, there will be needed a host of special studies.

Professor Boak's book on *The Master of the Offices* is such a study. Karlowa, Schiller, and the *Cambridge Medieval History* in their surveys of the empire in the fourth century describe in general terms the functions of the master of the offices at the height of his power. Seeck (in *Pauly-Wissowa*, IV, 633, 644 f.) has studied the origin of the master's office. Mommsen, in his *Ostgothischen Studien*, has set forth the rôle of the mastership in the Gothic kingdom of Italy and the Eastern Empire about 600 A.D. The later history of the mastership is told by Bury in his *Imperial Administration in the Ninth Century*. What Professor Boak now aims to supply is "a complete history of the mastership that will cover the whole period of its existence and trace clearly, so far as possible, in their proper chronological order, the various stages of its development and decline, showing the connection between these stages and the general tendencies which affected the administration as a whole" (pp. 3-4). He has performed his task admirably. The study is fully documented. There is a good bibliography and index. In Appendix A a list of the known Masters of the Offices to 700 A.D. is given. Students of the earlier periods of Roman history will be interested in the chapter which Professor Boak prefixes to his main study, on the Roman *Magistri* in general, and in the list of references to the title "magister" in inscriptions and literature which is given in Appendix A.

DONALD MCFAYDEN

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA